

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF ARIZONA

David Watson,

Plaintiff,

v.

Mike Ives, *et al.*,

Defendants.

No. CV-17-01906-PHX-JJT

ORDER

At issue is *pro se* Plaintiff David Watson's Third Amended Complaint (Doc. 9). In its prior Orders (Docs. 5, 7), the Court identified numerous fatal defects in Plaintiff's prior Complaints (Docs. 1, 4, 6). In the Third Amended Complaint, Plaintiff states, "No one but the jury is to open and read this claim. Interpretation of this claim by court personnel is not required. . . . Only assistance required of court personnel are as follows: Filing Claim, Having room available for court." (Doc. 9.) Thereafter, Plaintiff states he is suing for Defendants for "trespass upon his property." (Doc. 9.)


Plaintiff does not address the defects identified by the Court in its prior Orders. Most notably, Plaintiff does not establish that this Court has subject matter jurisdiction over his claims. As the Court explained in an earlier Order (Doc. 5), federal courts only have jurisdiction over a limited number of cases—generally either controversies between citizens of different states (diversity jurisdiction) or under federal law (federal question jurisdiction). It is clear from the Third Amended Complaint that no basis for federal court

1 jurisdiction is met here. Accordingly, the Court must dismiss this case without giving
2 Plaintiff leave to once again amend his Complaint. Fed. R. Civ. P. 12(h)(3).

3 IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that Plaintiff's Third Amended Complaint (Doc. 9)
4 is dismissed with prejudice for lack of subject matter jurisdiction.

5 IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the Clerk of Court is directed to enter judgment
6 accordingly and close this case.

7 Dated this 2nd day of August, 2017.

8
9 
10 _____
11 Honorable John J. Tuchi
12 United States District Judge
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28